



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/502,818	02/11/2000	Neelakantan Sundaresan	ARC-00-0004-US1	5719

7590 10/16/2002
Samuel A Kassatly
6819 Trinidad Drive
San Jose, CA 95120

EXAMINER

CHANNAVAJJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 10/16/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/502,818

Applicant(s)

SUNDARESAN, NEELAKANTAN

Examiner

Srirama Channavajjala

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 July 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☒ The proposed drawing correction filed on 15 July 2002 is: a) ☒ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 7/15/2002, paper no.4.
2. Examiner acknowledges and approved applicant's proposed drawing correction to fig 2, and a copy of approved fig 2 is hereby attached to this office action, paper no.6.
3. Claim 11 has been amended, paper no. # 6.
4. Claims 17-22 have been added, paper no. # 6.
5. Claims 1,6,11, and 17 are independent claims.
6. Claims 1-22 are pending in this application.

Drawings

7. The drawings filed on 2/11/2000 are approved by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152, however, applicant is required to submit formal drawing for fig.2 for Draftsperson approval in response to this office action, paper no. # 6.

Information Disclosure Statement

8. The information disclosure statement filed on 2/11/2000, paper no. # 2 has been considered and a copy was enclosed with this office action, paper no. # 3.

Specification

9. Applicant has incorporated by reference two co-pending applications, at page [1] line 5, page 14, line 4 of the specification. Examiner notes that incorporation by reference of an application in a printed United States patent constitutes a special circumstance under 35 U.S.C. § 122 warranting that access of the original disclosure of the application be granted. The incorporation by reference will be interpreted as a waiver of confidentiality of only the original disclosure as filed, and not the entire application file, *In re Gallo*, 231 USPQ 496 (Comm'r Pat. 1986). If Applicant objects to access to the entire application file, two copies of the information incorporated by reference must be submitted along with the objection. Failure to provide the material within the period provided will result in the entire application (including prosecution) being made available to petitioner. The Office will not attempt to separate the noted materials from the remainder of the application. Compare *In re Marsh Engineering Co.*, 1913 C.D. 183 (Comm'r Pat. 1913).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1- 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravets et al., [hereafter Kravets], US Patent No. 6363377 in view of Nasr et al., [hereafter Nasr], US Patent No. 6263332.

11. As to Claims 1,6,11, 17, Kravets teaches a system which including 'automatically generating dynamic search abstracts' [see Abstract, col 2, line 47-52, line 53-56], fig 11], Kravets teaches search engine for refining, filtering and organizing search queries and search results as detailed in Abstract, especially fig 11 is the query results corresponds to abstracts, 'a crawler for crawling documents and acquiring metadata and link information from the documents' [col 1, line 43-53, col 10, line 12-34, line 66-67, col 11, line 1-6], Kravets specifically suggests several web engines such as Alta Vista, Excite, Web Crawler capable of sending programs for example robots or crawlers which automatically peruse the web and gather web pages, automatically indexing the collected web pages as detailed in col 1, line 43-53, also Kravets teaches meta data related to each document that represents conditions to be satisfied in order for a document to be considered a match as detailed in table 2, col 10, line 23-26, 'a metadata repository for storing the metadata acquired by the crawler'

[col 1, line 47-55], Kravets suggests search engines store words of a documents corresponds to storing metadata acquired by web Crawler, 'an indexing engine for periodically indexing the metadata and the link information' [col 9, line 10-22, col 6, line 46-63], Kravets specifically teaches Harvest search engine fig 8, element 816 which is configured to index all the pages, examiner interpreting index engine corresponds to Kravets's Harvest search engine as detailed in fig 8, also Kravets teaches generating dynamic set of URLs as detailed inn col 9, line 10-12, 'a search engine for applying a search query to the metadata indexed by the indexing engine to generate a preliminary result set containing selected abstracts' [col 10, line 3-34, line 66-67, col 11, line 1-6, fig 4, fig 11] , 'search engine inquires if the link repository contains new link information about preliminary result set, and updates the selected abstracts based on the new link information, if any, to generate the dynamic search abstracts' [col 11, line 33-41, col 12, line 6-23, line 42-52]. It is however noted that Kravets does not specifically teach 'an abstract engine' although Kravets specifically suggests abstract query language that can easily be mapped to any particular engine's language [see col 10, line 13-14]. On the other hand, Nasr teaches a system which including 'an abstract engine' [see fig 1B, element 30, col 3, line 5-10].

It would have been obvious one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Nasr et al., into refining and improving search queries and organizing the results of a search query by different and overlapping criteria of Kravets because they both are directed to query processing,

more specifically searching for information on the Web using search engine [see Kravets: Abstract, Nasr: Abstract]. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to modify Kravets's fig 1A to incorporate the teachings of Nasr's Abstract Engine fig 1B, element 30 because that would have allowed users of Kravets's search query system to compile number of similar search quests in a number of differing languages such as detailed in fig 1B, elements 5a-5d, then abstract engine run the search to obtain search results, bringing the advantages of supporting any number of query languages, thus improving the processing of query and validate the results efficiently as suggested by Nasr [see col 2, line 22-24].

12. As to Claims 2,7, 14, 20, Kravets teaches a system which including 'query transformer, which when prompted by the search query, applies a query request to the metadata and the link information indexed by the indexing engine' [col 4, line 66-67, col 5, line 1-2, line 50-56, col 8, line 49-54].

13. As to Claims 3,8,15, 21, Kravets teaches a system which including 'search results transformer that transforms the dynamic search abstracts into a user browsable form' [col 7, line 61-65, col 8, line 18-25].

14. As to Claims 4,9,16,22, Kravets teaches a system which including 'link repository stores persistent link information and maintains a crawl history' [fig 1A, element 11, col 3, line 62-65].

Art Unit: 2177

15. As to Claims 5, 10, 12, 18, Kravets teaches a system which including 'at least one of the selected abstracts includes information gathered from a source other than a candidate page associated with the selected abstract' [fig 11, col 13, line 21-29].

16. As to Claims 13, 19 Kravets teaches a system which including 'if the link repository does not contain new link information, presenting abstracts previously stored in the link repository' [col 8, line 49-62].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on 7/15/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see discussion below:

17. At page 12, item 1, Claim 1, the user's interface is required to select the desired options, absence of which will not activate the system. As a result, the Kravets system cannot be said to be automatic.

As to the above argument Examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly, Kravets is directed to search engine for a refining, filtering and organizing search queries and search results [see Abstract], secondly, Kravets specifically teaches dynamic set of record tokens to restrict the results of a search query that infact saves users time as well as organize and search queries and documents that satisfy the query [see col 2, line 53-61], thirdly, Kravets specifically teaches for example search engine by automatically and selectively modifying individual query terms in users' query as detailed in col 2, line 47-52, further it is noted that Kravets suggests for example search engines send out programs called robots, or crawlers, which automatically peruse the Web and gather Web pages they discover. The collected pages are automatically indexed and collected into a database. [see col 1, line 47-50], therefore, Kravets teaches said to be automatic.

18. At page 12, item 2, Claim 1, As a result, the Kravets system, byitself, does not generate search abstracts.

As to the above argument, examiner in the office action stated that Kravets does not specifically teach an abstract engine, although Kravets specifically teaches automatically peruse the Web and gather web pages, in other words, collected web pages are automatically indexed into a database. On the other hand, Nasr specifically directed to abstract engine see fig 1B, element 30, col 3, line 5-10. Examiner noted that applicant agree with examiner that prior art Nasr teaches abstract engine [see page 11, item C]. Therefore, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants invention would have been motivated to combine Kravert with Nasr because that would have allowed uses of Kravert's search query system to compile number of similar search quests in a number of differing languages such as detailed in fig 1B, elements 5a-5d, then abstract engine run the search to obtain automatic search results.

19. At page 13, line 6-7 Kravets does not acquire link information.

As to the above argument examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly Kravets teaches search engine that dynamically filtering, organizing documents [see Abstract], secondly, fig 5 is directed to URL lens, more specifically URL lens element 510 similar documents, in other words, URL lens finds other URLs that contain the terms or links as detailed in col 6, line 46-63].

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

- a. US Patent No. 6363377
- b. US Patent No. 6263332

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure


- c. US Patent No. 6304864
- d. US Patent No. 6263364
- e. US Patent No. 6226630
- f. US Patent No. 6271840
- g. US Patent No. 6078914
- h. US Patent No. 6167409
- i. US Patent No. 6012087
- j. US Patent No. 6094649
- k. US Patent No. 5913210
- l. US Patent No. 6078866
- m. US Patent No. 5920859

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is (703) 308-8538. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703/746-7238	(After Final Communication)
703/746-7239	(Offical Communications)
703/746-7240	(For Status inquiries, draft communication)
(703) 308-6606	(Art Unit)

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

SC 
Patent Examiner.
September 30, 2002.